

No. 4747 號七十四百七千四第 日十三月二十年申壬治同 HONGKONG, TUESDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 1873. 二拜禮 號八十三月正英 港香 [PRICE \$2½ PER MONTH.]

Intimations.

Undermentioned Banks will CLOSE
TO-MORROW and THURSDAY, the
29th and 30th instants,
Hongkong, 23rd January, 1872.

the ORIENTAL BANK CORPORATION,
J. McDOWALL,
Manager, Hongkong.
the CHARTERED MERCANTILE BANK OF
INDIA, LONDON AND CHINA,
E. ARTHUR,
Manager, Hongkong.
the CHARTERED BANK OF INDIA, AUSTRALIA
AND CHINA,
M. W. BOYD,
Manager, Hongkong.
the COMPTON D'ESCOMPTES DE PARIS,
HONGKONG AGENTS,
A. PHILIPPE,
Acting Manager.
the HONGKONG AND SHANGHAI BANKING

JAMES CAMPBELL,
Chief Manager.
The NATIONAL BANK OF INDIA, LIMITED,
JAS. CAMPBELL.
157] Acting Manager.

FOR SALE:

worn and without vice, about
hands high, and quiet in Saddle.
Apply to
LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.
1 173 Hongkong, 24th January, 1873.
FOR YOKOHAMA AND HIOGO.
The Steamship
"OTTAWA,"
binson, Master, will have early despatch
overs.
For Freight and Passage, apply to


174 Hongkong, 23d January, 1873.
SWATOW, AMOY, AND FOOCHEW.
The Steamship
"FORMOSA,"
will have immediate des-
patches for the above Ports.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
DOUGLAS LAPRAKE & Co.
175 Hongkong, 25th January; 1873.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES
MARITIMES.
PAQUEBOT POSTE FRANCAIS.

"MENZALEH,"
 ain Mourrut, will be despatched for
 YOKOHAMA,
 ly after the arrival of the next French
 C. BERTRAND,
Principal Agent.
 6 Hongkong, 28th January, 1873.
 NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE D'INTERCOMMERCES
MARITIMES.
PAQUEBOT POSTE FRANCAIS.
—
The Company's Steamship
"MEI-KONG,"
Captain Fouché, will be dispatched for
SHANGHAI,
directly after her arrival from Europe.
C. BRETAND.

77 Hongkong, 29th January, 1873.



ARMY CONTRACTS FOR 1873-74.
SEALED TENDERS, in duplicate, marked
outside "Tenders for Army Contracts,"
to be received by the Undersigned until noon
MONDAY, the 3rd February, 1873, for such
quantities of Commissariat and Hospital Sup-

and Light, &c., or for the performance of
Trucks and Hospital Services, such as wash-
ing and repairing Bidding, repairing Uten-
sils, &c., or for the Cleaning of the Roads,
Cafes, &c., at the various Cantonments at
Hongkong (Victoria, Kowloon, and Stanley),
and other Scavenger's Work, and for Sweeping
Highways, Cleaning and Lighting Exterior
Walls, Removing Rubbish, &c., as may from
time to time be required for the use of Her
Majesty's Forces.

Forms of Tender, (no other than those issued by the Control Department will be received.) Conditions of Contract, Plans, Specifications, and approximate areas as regards the Sewerage Contract, and any further information that may be required, can be obtained on application at this Office, between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. daily.

control Office,
Hongkong, 27th January, 1873. [sd 167
TEA-TASTER " CLERK.
THE Advertiser, who has come out seeking,
desires an engagement as above. Would
experience with Salary for the first Six Months.
Address "P.O." The Club, Foochow.
at 2075 Foochow, 21st November 1872.

FIRST-CLASS English BAROUCHE,
Silver mounted.
LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.
144 152 Hongkong, 21st January, 1873.

KRUPP'S CAST STEEL WORKS,
ESSEN (GERMANY.)
SOLE AGENT FOR CHINA AND
JAPAN.
F. PEIL.
1871, Trankens, Sleswick, (Germany.)

Notices to Consignees.
S. AUGUST LEFFLER, FROM-BATAVIA
AND SINGAPORE.
THE above steamer having arrived. Con-
signees will please send their Bills of
Lading to the Undersigned for Counter-signa-
ture, and take immediate delivery of Cargo.
Cargo remaining on board after noon TO-

NORTON, LYALL & Co.,
 Agents
 of 44 Hongkong, 4th January, 1873.
 COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES
 MARITIMES.
 NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.
 CONSIGNEES of the following cargo are

the undersigned for countersignature, and make immediate delivery; this Cargo has been loaded and stored at their risk and expense. No fire insurance has been effected.

C. BERTRAND,
Principal Agent.

Ex S. S. "Ara," 11th April.

BB&O or TFB1 and 2, 2 cases Merchandise.
Ex "Sindh."

FF, 53, ... 1 case Medicine.
... 1 bale Cotton.

FROM, No. 1	1 case	Methandico.
Es a Pel-ho,	16th	January.
P.F.C. 1877/61	6 case	Wine.
Sheppard	1 case	Provisions.
Birley & Co.	1 case	Shoes.
J. T. P. Forster	1 case	Sundries.
N, in diamond, \$2	1 case	Glassware.
R. in diamond,	1 case	Lead Pipe.
OE, \$103	1 case	Shoes.
U 170 Hongkong	25th	January, 1872.

100

THE "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY"

For 1873.

NOW READY.

THIS Work, now in the ELEVENTH year of its existence, is ready for delivery.

It has been compiled and printed at the Daily Press Office, as usual, from the best and most authentic sources, and no pains have been spared to make the work complete in all respects.

In addition to the usual varied and voluminous information, the value of the "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1873" has been further augmented by a

CHRONO-LITHOGRAPH OF THE FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS OF SHANGHAI.

In addition to a Chrono-Lithograph Plate of the NEW CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE AT THE PEAK;

also, OF THE VARIOUS HOUSE-FLAGS (Designed expressly for this Work);

MAPS OF HONGKONG, JAPAN, and of the COAST OF CHINA;

besides other local information and statistics corrected to date of publication, tending to make this work in every way suitable for Public, Mercantile, and General Offices.

The Directory is published in Two Forms, Complete at \$5; or with the Lists of Residents, Port Directories, Mails, &c., at \$8.

Orders for Copies may be sent to the Daily Press Office, or to the following Agents:-

- Shanghai, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Amoy, Messrs. WILSON, NICHOLS & CO.
- Swatow, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Peking, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Yokohama, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Hankow, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Canton, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Hongkong, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Shanghai, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Amoy, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Swatow, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Peking, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Yokohama, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Hankow, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Canton, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.
- Hongkong, Messrs. GILSON AND CAMPBELL.

NOTICE.

THE "DAILY PRESS" will in future be issued at 6.30 A.M. The arrangement has been made to meet the views of numerous subscribers, and it may be desirable to state that the step would have been adopted earlier, but that it was considered advisable to publish as such an hour as would give time for reporting the latest arrivals and departures. This end, will, however, be met by the issue of an extra slip at 1 p.m., with the arrivals in the course of the morning.

Advertisements can be received up to 10 A.M., and those sent in the morning can, when desired, be inserted for the first time in the Shipping Extra.

Hongkong, 24th January, 1873.

At the Hotel d'Europe, on the 27th inst., the wife of N. TAMCO ARBERG, Esq., of a son. [172]

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, JANUARY 28th, 1873.

In the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, yesterday did not present any very startling feature for notice, it was one at all events of a business-like and practical character, and will, we doubt not, lead to useful results. The most important subjects considered were, the questions of the survey of the coast and the erection of lighthouses. The midweek question was equally important in one sense, but for some reason little or nothing was said with regard to it. The silence on this subject of the Singapore Chamber was attributed to their having a reticent Scotsman as Chairman, but as there is no such reason in Hongkong, it is perhaps to be regretted that more was not said with regard to it.

The suggestion made by Mr. COXES, that steps should be taken by other Governments besides that of England to co-operate in the survey of the coast, was a very reasonable one, and it may be hoped will aid in bringing about the desired result. The matter is eminently one in which such co-operation would be desirable, as vessels of all nationalities are engaged in the trade. The plan, however, which he suggested, of writing to the various Chambers of Commerce was open to the objection of its being likely to take time, and the resolution to do this, in addition to addressing the Senior naval officers, instead of giving up the latter plan, is decidedly the most desirable, especially as the latter will address their Governments with authority on such a subject.

Government, were well to the point. It certainly does seem extraordinary, when votes for military contributions, for Pokfulam reservoirs, and indefinite sums for bungalows at the Peak, to say nothing of the enormous amounts for salaries in all directions, can be voted without hesitation, an extraordinary fit should come over our rulers when money is wanted for an urgent commercial necessity, especially when heavy fees are obtained from the junks, and it is always considered that, at least, a fair proportion of shipping dues should be devoted to the purposes of lighting coasts and harbours.

Although, as above noticed, little was said concerning the midweek question the few remarks which were made were of interest. We are certainly as much at a loss as was the Chairman of the meeting to account for the surveyors at home having declared a halt-suspended with mildew, and so returned, to be re-damaged. Of course there may be different notions of sea-damage, but in strictness it ought to be some direct damage from sea-water, and not any injury, possibly entirely atmospheric, which may be sustained on the journey. However the point is fortunately not of much importance as to the general bearing of the subject, as it seems now admitted on all sides that defective Sizing is the cause of the mildew, and that this is the point at which a remedy must be sought for the evil.

We must, we suppose, make up our mind to see the opening of the port of Kiang-chow indefinitely postponed, and add one more to the long list of the negotiations which have been made a non-event. Mr. H. J. ALLEN, who for the last eight months has been in Canton waiting to take up his appointment as Vice-consul in Hainan, is, we learn, under orders to proceed to Foochow to re-place Mr. CARROLL, at Pagoda Anchorage, and it is scarcely likely that H.M. Minister, after having kept an office in readiness to open the port for the space of eight months, would remove him now if he saw any probability of the port being declared open within a reasonable time. Indeed, the question forms an interesting rule of three: if Kiang-chow is still closed eight months after it was thought necessary to despatch a Vice-consul to take charge of the port, in how many months will the port be open after the Vice-consul is withdrawn? We will not pretend to give an answer, but we think that persons interested have good reason to complain that such long delay has occurred in obtaining for the subjects of Treaty Powers the enjoyment of a right which was conceded so long ago as the year 1858.

When the late Mr. WILLIAMS was appointed Consul for the United States in the early part of last year, and Mr. HARR personally visited the port on behalf of the Chinese Government, we hoped that before now Hongkong would have been benefiting from such trade as the opening of a port on the South of the Province will develop, but we seem to be no further than we were two months ago, as regards the admission of foreign merchants into Hainan, while as regards our general position, we have given the Chinese another proof of the apathy with which we allow ourselves to be put off on some pretext or other whatever the occasion. We believe we are right when we say that so far back as July last H.M. Consul at Canton was daily expecting to start for Hainan, having in his wake the staff which he was to install at the new port, and three or four merchants eager to see what was to be done. This will show that no difficulty appears to have been raised at Canton, where such regulations respecting residence and trade as the requirements of the place seemed to demand could have been agreed upon.

That the Chinese Government at Peking made no objection to the opening of Kiang-chow, there can be no doubt. H.M. Minister and the Inspector-General of Customs made their arrangements as if the matter in all its details was on the point of being settled. We can only suppose that by referring to Peking trivial questions of nono but local importance our authorities have given to the Chinese an opportunity of deferring the discharge of their obligations, and thus gratifying their childish propensity for offering opposition to what they know full well is inevitable.

We repeat, it is to be regretted that the foreign Ministers, who took the matter up, should have allowed themselves to be foiled in this way; but, as the representative of larger interests, and the Minister on whose injunctory action the others are contented to wait, more blame attaches to Mr. WAXE. He allowed the mercantile body to believe, and, indeed, himself believed, that foreigners would shortly have access to the West Coast of the Canton Province, but neither directly nor indirectly has he volunteered any information or explanation respecting what must be considered the miscarriage of his negotiations. So much in the dark are we kept concerning a question of considerable importance to Hongkong, and we believe our Colonial Government is no more enlightened than we are, that those interested in the opening of Hainan are reduced to watching the movements of the Consul and Customs officials, who, it is understood, are to be stationed at the new port, and of the Customs' steamer now lying in Canton in readiness to convey the staff when the time comes.

SUPREME COURT.

IN CHANCERY.

Before the Hon. Chief Justice SMITH.

Harper and another v. Lee-sing and another.

Mr. Drummond, instructed by Messrs. B. Sharp and Toller, appeared for the plaintiffs. Mr. Hayllar, instructed by Messrs. Caldwell and Brecken, appeared for the defendants. The case was called on for the Crown, which was a defendant to the bill.

The Attorney-General said there was one point of the case in which the rights of the Crown might be involved, and therefore the Crown had been made a party. He had made enquiries for certain papers which would throw light on the division of the reclamations. These he had not yet been able to get, but he would place them before the Court at a later stage of the case.

Mr. Drummond then opened the case for the plaintiffs. The bill was between G. Harper and A. Melver (administrators of D. Gow, deceased), Plaintiff, and Lee-sing and another, Defendants. The bill was to the following effect: By a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and T. F. Edgar, Marine Lot 57 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 58 was demised to H. H. P. for 75 years. Marine Lot 59, after the expiration of the term, was assigned to the plaintiffs, Harper and Melver, by a lease dated 28th October, 1844, between H. H. P. and

The captain and mate of the ship *Carl*, recently engaged in kidnapping South Sea Islanders, have been sentenced to death at Sydney for murder.

POPULAR RELIGION, in three Lectures. By
E. J. EITEL. *Second Edition.* One Volume.
Subscription price, \$1.00.
Subscriptions will be received by Messrs.
J. W. CRAWFORD & Co.
140 134 Hongkong, 20th January, 1873.

TRUBNER & Co.,
60, PATEENOSTER ROW;
W. H. BELL,
"DAILY PRESS" OFFICE, HONGKONG.

and that he has always a great quantity
BEST COAL in store for Sale. Gentlemen
ship-masters wishing to patronise him, are
requested to apply at his Shop.
1895. Hongkong 20th Jan 1873

lished since 1855, at *Endicott's Lane*, and
has always a great quantity of Best
in store for Sale. Gentlemen or Ship-
wishing to patronise him, are requested
at his Shop,
HONGKONG, 24th April 1859

Further information as to Passage or
t. apply at the Agency of the Company.
West.
T. A. HARRIS,
Agent.
January 25th 1922

10¢ each. Four Quizzes or Book
 Packets, or Packets of Patterns.
 Registration Fee, 15 cents each Letter.
F. W. MITCHELL,
Postmaster General
 Post Office,
 March 10, 1892

